DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 167 922 CG 013 328

AUTHOR Sparacio, Richard T.
TITLE Credentialing Survey of Human Development Counseling Graduate Students Attitudes Toward Licensure, Program Accreditation and Professional Identity.
PUB DATE Dec 78
NOTE 77p.; Appendices C,D,E,H,I not filmed due to copyright

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accreditation (Institutions); *Counselor Certification; *Counselor Qualifications; Counselor Role; *Credentials; Graduate Students; Higher Education; *Professional Services; State Licensing Boards; *Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

A movement in many states proposes licensing those that wish to identify themselves as professional counselors. In attempting to pass licensing legislation, however, the question of support becomes a critical one. In order to survey the attitudes of a group of Human Development Counseling (HDC) graduate students, licensure, program accreditation and professional identity were put to a sample group. Results indicate strong support for credentialed counselor and licensure. HDC students also indicated the need for stronger role definition for counselors and the need for a philosophical base from which to work. The survey questionnaire, reports from the APGA and an annotated bibliography of ERIC search results are included in the appendices. (PK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CREDENTIALING SURVEY OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT COUNSELING GRADUATE STUDENTS ATTITUDES TOWARD LICENSURE, PROGRAM ACCREDITATION AND PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY

by

Richard T. Sparacio

Master of Arts

Wayne State University

and

Master of Governmental Administration

Wharton Graduate Division

University of Pennsylvania

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R T Sparacio

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

ED167922

CG 013 328

An Independent Study Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of

Requirements for the Degree of

Specialist in Education

in

Human Development Counseling

of

Programs for Human Development Specialists

George Peabody College for Teachers

December 1978

Major Professor Roger F. Aubrey Date November 14, 1978

Program Director _____ Date _____

Executive Dean for Academic Affairs _____ Date _____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project would be incomplete without acknowledging the invaluable assistance of Dr. Roger Aubrey and Dr. William Barkley. Their suggestions and comments helped me keep the direction of this survey clearly focused. Dr. Roger Aubrey's continual encouragement and willingness to read rough drafts immediately upon their completion was tremendously inspiring to me. His efforts in not delaying what seemed like a slow process motivated me to also not delay that process.

Dr. William Barkley's willingness to serve as a second reader deserves a special note of appreciation. The faculty member who was to serve as the original second reader for this survey relocated geographically, so Dr. Barkley agreed to fill this vacancy and review the survey from its initial proposal to its final completion. Such efforts go "above and beyond" those normally expected from faculty. I am grateful to both men for being what they teach, genuine helping professionals.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Scope and Purpose	2
	Support for Credentialing	2
	Support for Accreditation	5
	A Brief History of APGA's Accreditation Activity	6
	Professional Identity	10
	Clarification or Bias	10
II	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	12
	Credentialing Dilemma	12
	How We Arrived at the Licensing Dilemma	15
	Importance of Licensure	16
	Counselor Supervisors Opinion of the Licensure Movement	17
	Role of the Federal Government	19
	Role of the Courts	20
	Role of APGA	22
	APGA's Special Committee for Credentialing	23
	Present Credentialing System	23
	Implications of a Tennessee Counselor Licensing Law	25
III	METHODOLOGY	26
	ERIC Search	26
	Correspondence	27
	Interviews	28
	Survey Population	28
	Survey	30
	Survey Distribution and Response Rate	30
	Track II Responses	32
	Identifying Information	32
	Respondents Degree Level	33
	Direction of Students	33
	Method Used to Analyze Results	34
IV	RESULTS	36
	Question One	36
	Question Two-A	38
	Question Two-B	39
	Question Three-A	41
	Question Three-B	42

Section	Page
V CONCLUSION	45
Similar Conclusions	48
REFERENCE NOTES	50
REFERENCES	51
APPENDICES	54

A National Licensure Network, Guidepost, February 2, 1978, page 3.

B A Draft Proposal for Legislation Regulating Marriage, Family, and Child Counselors. Unpublished.

C Standards for the Preparation of Counselors and Personnel Service Specialists, (Adopted by ACES Membership October 1973). Personnel and Guidance Journal, June 1977, pages 596-601.

D Final Report, APGA Special Committee for Credentialing, November 4, 1977. Unpublished.

E Current Status and Opinionnaire of ACES Members Concerning Licensure and Requirements. Members Views: Program Approval and Quality of Training, by Marguerite Carroll. Unpublished.

Current Status and Opinionnaire of ACES Members Concerning Licensure Requirements. Members Recommendation for Action, by Marguerite Carroll. Unpublished.

F Questionnaire

G Responses - Track I

Responses - Track II

H American Association of Sex Educators, Counselors, and Therapists. (Application and Training Requirements)

I ERIC Search Results -- Annotated Bibliography

SECTION ONE

INTRODUCTION

Before examining the content of this project, it may be helpful to briefly survey the subject matter headings and content included in the project. Possibly, by providing some idea of what is and is not included in the project, the process of reviewing will be made easier.

The project is divided into six separate sections. The first section discusses the scope and purpose of this credentialing survey along with a brief history of American Personnel and Guidance Association's (A.P.G.A.) accreditation activities. Also included in the first section is an overview of the questions the study is intended to answer. The second section is an attempt to review literature related to the credentialing problems facing counselors. The third section discusses the methodology used to gather literature, distribute the survey, and collect and analyze the responses. Section three also discusses the results as they relate to identifying information given by respondents on the survey. Section four of the project is reserved for examining results as they relate to the specific hypothesis or questions asked in section one. Section five includes a summary of other unanticipated findings which are related directly to the survey. Although these results discuss the Human Development Counseling (H.D.C.) program itself, the influence of these findings on student's responses seems pertinent. Section six is a brief review of the survey results

and the conclusions drawn from those results. While the results of this study are completed, the credentialing task for counselors is still unfinished and the need to complete this task remains.

Scope and Purpose

As stated on page one of the proposal titled Credentialing Survey of Human Development Counseling Graduate Students Attitudes Toward Licensure, Program Accreditation and Professional Identity, the purpose of this study was stated as answering three basic questions. These questions are:

1. To what extent does support exist among Human Development Counseling (HDC) students for licensure as a credentialing process for counselors?

2. To what extent does support among Human Development Counseling (HDC) students for APGA institutional program accreditation as a form of credentialing? Does support exist for APGA institutional program accreditation over other forms of credentialing? What is the most preferred form of credentialing?

3. Do HDC counselors feel they need a more clearly defined philosophical base from which to operate? Do Human Development Counseling (HDC) students think that they need to differentiate the specific functions of their profession from those of other mental health professionals? Do HDC students think there is a need for a clearer identity? (Sparacio, Note 7, p. 2)

The scope of this study is limited in process to the group defined as Human Development Counseling students in the Peabody HDC Program, and in content to the specific questions (hypotheses) stated above. Its scope and purpose is nothing more nor less than accomplishing this task.

Support for Credentialing

In an interview held with Dr. Linda Rudolph, Tennessee's licensure coordinator, on April 3, 1978, she stated that because of the fact that

many counselors don't understand the issue of licensure there is a lack of concern and support for it. "Because many counselors are comfortable in their present positions they are apathetic about the issues of credentialing," said Dr. Rudolph. She felt this degree of support for credentialing (or lack of it) could be attributed to factors of misunderstanding and misinformation. She sees her role as licensure coordinator as one of educating counselors on this single important issue--credentialing.

Although there may be a feeling of apathy among many counselors in Tennessee, the counseling literature reflects a different mood. Many writers are calling for the passage of state statutes to regulate those who wish to identify themselves as professional counselors (Sweeney & Witmer, 1977). There presently is a national licensure network for counselors seeking advice or assistance in licensure matters (Guidepost, February 2, 1978). This national network reflects a national attitude and movement toward licensure. Other writers have gone so far as to even suggest alternative ways for counselors to work for the passage of licensure. Sweeney and Sturdevant (1974) state that for those who wish to maintain the counseling profession's identity, under another heading than psychology, the following proposed alternatives are offered:

> Alternative #1: In states without licensure laws for psychologists, counselor associations may wish to propose legislation independently or jointly with the state psychological associations for licensure of counselors and psychologists. In states with "liberal" licensure laws for psychologists, counselor associations may wish to study the existing law for possible amendments or separate legislation that would recognize the counseling profession as an equal partner. School psychology has this distinction in Ohio and other states.

> Alternative #2: Where licensing of counselors is already under psychology, APGA members may seek means of gaining representation on the state boards and examining committees.
>
> Alternative #3: In states where licensure is apparently discriminatory, test cases may be developed to revise or clarify the interpretation of the law.
>
> Alternative #4: In states where privileged communication is not afforded clients of counselors, efforts to do so may be undertaken through advisement with members in states that have such statutes.
>
> Alternative #5: In light of recent trends towards competence-based counselor training programs and certification, APGA members may wish to develop strategies for licensure in other than the traditional mode. (Sweeney & Sturdevant, 1974, pp. 579-580)

These alternatives may have application to the situation in Tennessee; however, before any action is taken the question of support must be answered.

Although there is a strong movement toward licensure within the counseling profession, it is not a national issue. Psychology licensure laws are written and adopted separately by each of the fifty state legislatures and some state licensing laws and licensing boards are more repressive than others.

> Since state licensure must be achieved independently in each of the 50 states, the achievement of nationwide licensure will probably take several years to implement. For this reason other credentialing approaches need immediate attention. For instance, a method of evaluating and approving preparation programs and a professional register of qualified practitioners would each contribute to overall credibility of counseling. (Forster, 1978)

In attempting to pass licensing legislation, the question of support becomes a critical one. Licensure is a state issue and before any initiative is taken by state licensure coordinators (such as Dr. Rudolph), the question of support must be answered. It must be known if broad support for that plan does, or does not exist. Do counselors support a new credentialing procedure? Do counselors want

a new credentialing law? Do counselors want licensure to be a part of that law? These were the questions around which the first hypothesis was formulated.

Support for Accreditation

Lawrence K. Jones, in a study conducted under the sponsorship of Association of Counselor Educators and Supervisors (ACES) and presented at the 1975 APGA New York convention, found "that the overwhelming majority of institutions graduated more students than they have staff to adequately train. At the extremes, it raises serious ethical concerns" (p. 34). Jones (1975) found eight institutions with three or fewer full-time faculty positions graduating more than one hundred persons in a year. How can such programs be accredited? An examination of the history of accreditation in the counseling and guidance ranks may be helpful in answering this question.

From the results of the Jones (1975) study it would appear that the counseling profession has been unconcerned with institutional accreditation, but this has not been the case. The efforts and move toward institutional accreditation within APGA dates back to the early 1960s. This is a period of over 25 years. And prior to APGA's existence, the National Vocational Guidance Association appointed a committee to prepare a statement on the preparation of counselors in 1974. The final report of this committee outlined a common core of training for all counselors (VanHoose & Pietrofesa, 1970). These efforts are mentioned to illustrate the fact that the struggle for an accreditation policy has been a continual one. Although the move toward accreditation has had a long history within the APGA ranks it is still uncertain

(until recently) whether the issue of credentialing was to be of significance. What follows is a brief outline of the history of ACES's accreditation efforts with APGA extracted from "An Introduction to the Standards for the Preparation of Counselors and Other Personnel Services Specialists" by Forster (1977).

A Brief History of ACES-APGA's Accreditation Activity

1960 The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) began a five-year Planning Cooperative Study of Counselor Education Standards. This was done by tapping the reactions of 150 grass roots committees in all 50 states.

1964 Counselor Education standards were developed and presented at the 1964 San Francisco APGA Convention. The standards presented were to be used on an experimental basis for a three-year period for institutional self-evaluation.

1967 The standards were adopted and a manual for applying the standards to counselor education programs was also developed.

1967 Concomitant with these efforts were major studies by the American School Counselor Association (ASCA), which developed a statement of policy and implementation guidelines for secondary school counselors.

1968 Having worked out standards for secondary school counselors, ACES turned its attention to standards for preparing elementary school counselors. After a committee spent three years developing the standards, they were approved.

1969 Standards for the preparation of student personnel workers were adopted by ACES.

1971 A Commission on Standards and Accreditation was formed by APGA and assigned the task of developing a revised and combined set of standards that would serve the whole profession. This action was generated by a belief that separate standards for each specialization was a diffusion of energy and that the separate standards could be combined into a comprehensive document.

1973 The ACES membership approved the revised, combined standards, and subsequently they were adopted by ASCA and the Board of Directors of APGA.

1976 An ACES committee was formed in 1976 to develop guidelines for advanced graduate degree programs in counselor education, since

the standards adopted were not intended for use in preparing doctoral students or paraprofessionals.

1977 ACES approved the guidelines for advanced graduate degree programs in counselor education in 1977. (Forster, 1977, p. 595)

In looking at this history it can be seen that there has been a continued effort by ACES--the people who educate, train, and supervise counselors--in the area of preparation standards for counselors. The fact that these efforts have resulted in no "nationally adopted or recognized" preparation standards raises two serious questions regarding ACES efforts. First, although endorsed and adopted by ACES and APGA, why have these standards not found their way into or have not been adopted by the institutions involved in training and educating counselors? Secondly, why isn't there a formal plan or method for approving and endorsing counselor preparation programs by ACES? "While the counseling profession has given attention to the ingredients of a satisfactory preparation program, no satisfactory plan for approving preparation programs exists" (Forster, 1977).

In response to the two questions stated above, the answer to the first question lies in the statement of the second. This is to say that because there has never been a procedure for "officially" approving counselor preparation programs and because abiding by the ACES endorsed standards has been totally voluntary, few--if any--institutions which train and educate counselors have voluntarily committed themselves to these standards. There is no doubt in my mind that the lack of a method for approving counselor preparation programs accounts for many of the dismal facts which have been known but finally documented in the Jone's (1975) study. The fact that credentialing/licensure is usually linked

with the completion of an accredited or an approved program is at the heart of the credentialing problem. Forster (1977) states that although the APGA Professional Preparation and Standards Committee was active as early as the 1960s, a spirit of serious concern seemed to be missing, as no vehicle was developed to accredit preparation programs. This can not presently be the case. Presently, approximately 275 counselor education programs in the country have NCATE accreditation at one or more of the three levels of accreditation recognized by NCATE: master's, specialists, and doctoral (NCATE, 1977). Since NCATE accredits only programs preparing personnel for elementary and secondary schools, there is an increasing amount of confusion with respect to the role of accreditation in counselor education (Stripling, 1978). Because many counselor education programs are preparing students for positions outside of the school settings.

It is believed that many established training institutions would be willing to bear the expense and difficulties of accreditation--or go out of the counselor education business--if counselor program approval could become a part of a larger recognized umbrella accrediting body. If ACES or APGA had affiliations with such an umbrella accrediting body, leverage could be exerted on non-complying institutions, since the institutions total accreditation would depend on compliance and approval of the accrediting body. The Council on Post-Secondary Accreditation (COPA) and the National Council for Accreditation (NCATE) are two such accreditating bodies who could <u>support</u> and <u>assist</u> ACES' enforcement of their preparation standards if such an affiliation existed or could be developed. One reason why such an affiliation does not exist is not because there has been a lack of effort, but

rather because COPA and NCATE "discourage a proliferation of accreditation bodies for various professional groups, if they are not clearly distinguishable from other groups" (Forster, 1977). Although, I feel, the profession is clearly distinguishable from other professions, the concern of these accrediting bodies is appreciated.

As the situation now stands, counselor education programs are accredited by NCATE and that accreditation is controlled by COPA. "Over 95% of the counselor education in the United States are under the control of colleges, schools, or departments of education. Consequently, the accrediting agency for counselor education is the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)" (Stripling, 1978). Although APGA may have a burning interest in the matter, their authority is "peripheral" at best.

A new organization was formed through the merger of the National Council on Accreditation and the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education. It is called the Council on Post-Secondary Accreditation. "COPA is now the umbrella organization of all accrediting groups in higher education and is therefore the parent organization of NCATE" (Stripling, 1968).

In light of this brief overview of program accreditation, let us now move to Question Three. Question Two tried to go beyond Question One and the question of support for licensure and determine if HDC students support program accreditation, and if so, what form of credentialing (if any) is most desired by them. Question Three tries to answer the question of professional identity and the need for a philosophical base among counselors.

Professional Identity

"Does the profession need a clearer identity with a clear philosophical base and the designation of specific function?" is a broad question posed by Forster, 1977. There are arguments both pro and con for a more focused philosophical base for counselors. Opponents state that counselors should keep their definitions and roles as broad as possible, to keep from unnecessarily restricting the range of their services that may be provided (Forster, 1977). Self-declared restrictions could be used to narrow the territory defined as belonging to counselors. Proponents feel that before counselors can really call themselves a profession worthy of licensure, a formal philosophical statement including specific functions, must be established. It seems important to determine how counselors in the HDC program view this issue.

Question Three was developed to determine if HDC students believe that there is a need to differentiate the functions of the counselors from other mental heatlh professionals. It is also hoped that Question Three would aid in determining if HDC counselors feel there is a need for a clearer identity.

Clarification or Bias

One area that should be clarified before a study of this nature can be undertaken is the perspective from which the writer views the issue of credentialing. A great deal of interest in the licensure issue is the result of a backlash to the restrictive practices of licensing boards controlled by psychologists. Accepting this fact, it is believed, "The renewed interest in licensure flows from a strength

within the counseling profession. This strength is based on the realization that the counseling movement has met real needs that are not met by other professions" (Forster, 1977). This point is best exemplified in the comments of a respondent to the Carroll study (1977). One respondent states, "Had I wished to become a psychologist, I would have done so--I chose to be a counselor. Now I have to pass a psychologist's exam to collect fees for counseling." (See Appendix E for additional comments from this study).

The interest in licensure, it is believed, it based on a belief and pride in counseling and the profession itself. A belief that counselors have done more to facilitate individual development than other professions. The interest in licensure is not based on a desire to be a psychologist, but the desire to be a recognized professional.

SECTION TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

What follows is a brief review of the literature related to the subject of credentialing. This review is by no means exhaustive, however, the author feels it is representative of literature presently appearing in the professional journals on the subject of credentialing.

Credentialing Dilemma

"Counseling, as a profession, has a long way to go before its practitioners are given the same professional recognition as psychologists, including counseling psychologists" (Morgan, 1976). There are many reasons for this lack of profession recognition, and first among these is no legislation that defines counseling (Testimony for H. R. 1423, Sweeney, 1975).

The definition for professional counseling is contined in the American Psychological Association's definition of the practice of psychology. " . . . everything the counselor might do is contained in the APA model definitions" (Sweeney, 1975). This fact in and of itself would not be a problem if credentialed counselors could be licensed, as such, by the existing boards. The problem arises in the indiscriminate actions taken by state licensing boards in refusing to license credentialed counselors in spite of the APA Division 17 resolutions recommending that State Boards not exclude licensure applicants

on the basis of an Ed.D. degree, or the department grant the degree (Division 17, APA, Report of Division 17, Counseling Psychologist, 1975, 5 [3], 135. [a] Licensing and certification).

Licensure Boards often do not accept the ligitimacy of the educational and social framework of the helping professionals that exist outside of psychology (e.g., social worker, school counselor, family and marriage counselor) (Carroll, Griggs, & Halligan, 1977). This is the problem. "American Psychological Association Boards of Examiners in many states have both defined and regulated the practice of psychology, while trained professionals in related mental health fields have been denied access to licensure and therefore, the practice of their profession. The result is a closed shop" (Carroll, Griggs, & Halligan, 1977).

The results of this dilemma and the impetus to rectify it are clear and irreversible. A national APGA licensure network is now in place in 39 states and the District of Columbia to assist counselors experiencing difficulty in obtaining state certification or licensure (Guide Post, 1978). A list of the names, addresses, and phone numbers of the state representatives is contained in Appendix A.

The cases of individuals being denied licensure to practice counseling are numerous and well documented. Carroll, Griggs, and Halligan state, in a survey conducted among ACES membership, that "twenty-five p[illegible]ent of those who attempted to take the exam, or 97 respondents, report they were refused the exam. Almost two-thirds of the refusals came from the following states: Alabama, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, New York, Texas, Virginia" (Carroll, Griggs, & Halligan, 1977). In fact, not only are counselors who seek

licensure for the first time being denied licenses to practice, but those professionals who actually have been licensed in one state are being denied licensure in other states where they seek licensure because of narrow interpretation of statutes (Morgan, 1974). These restrictive licensing practices do not exist for legal and medical professionals. Although additional testing may be required, these professions (generally) have a well established and liberal reciprocity system.

The credentialing problem can be stated as the inability of "counselors" to be recognized as bonafide professionals by present psychology licensing boards of examiners. This issue compounded with the general lack of a credentialing procedure of their own has created a real dilemma for counselors. The problem has been stated in more emphatic terms by the first chairman of the APGA Commission on Counselor Licensure. He states, "that counselors are being discriminated against in a manner that also deprives the public of the services it needs" (Sweeney, 1977). Although stating the problem in these dimensions may clarify the issue, it still does not permit a narrow focus of the issue for research examination. For research purposes the problem must be more clearly conceptualized.

After reviewing the literature on the subject, there seemed to be some recurring themes centered around the questions of support, licensure vs. other forms of credentialing, and professional identity. The hypotheses of this study were structured around these issues, and the purpose of this study was to answer specific questions (hypotheses) shown in response to these issues.

How We Arrived at the Licensing Dilemma

The counseling movement has evolved in response to important needs of individuals in our complex, pluralistic society (Forster, 1976). Similar to the society it was helping, the developing of the counseling profession was itself just as complex, pluralistic and sometimes disorganized. The APGA which was created from looser affiliations of related organizations was certainly the beginning of an organized counseling movement. Although Sputnik and NDEA legislation helped the counseling movement grow and expand, much of this growth was without direction. This rapid growth seemed to contribute to the profession's lack of a credentialing system outside the education setting. Since most of this growth was within the educational setting, other settings that needed a credentialing system went unattended. Counselor preparation programs grew rapidly, and little attention was directed toward quality control or credentialing (Forster, 1976). As the field expanded rapidly, new approaches flourished, and leaders warned against premature definitions and restrictions (Hill, 1967). The concern for premature definitions and restrictions seems to have led to very little definition at all and the concern over restrictions may have been the result of a rapidly expanding new professions's sense of insecurity about closing its doors to new members. A profession built on facilitating individual human development such as counseling and guidance may have found it difficult to move toward an effective credentialing procedure which could at times be seen as both restrictive and exclusive.

Importance of Licensure

Licensing is important as a credentialing procedure for several reasons. First, it is commonly known that 50% of all counselors are employed outside of education. There is no credentialing procedure for counselors gaining credence outside the school system, (except those procedures mentioned under a section of this paper titled Present Credentialing System). The absences of a credentialing method for counselors outside of education is a weakness of the profession. What is at the root of the licensing problem? Why haven't counselors had a credentialing procedure? "The lack of a clear identity, including a focused philosophical base and clear designation of functions, underlies the problem of establishing an effective credentialing process" (Forster, 1976).

Another serious implication for counselors, if they choose not to work toward a credentialing process of their own, is that their professional prerogatives may be dictated by more restrictive laws for psychologists. If we do not assume responsibility for our profession, we have little choice but to accept the leadership of other professional groups" (Sweeney & Sturdevant, 1974). Is licensure necessary? Yes. Because if we choose not to develop a credentialing process within our profession, it may well be developed by others outside of it.

The Special Committee for credentialing thought that the problem of licensure was so important that it recommended, in its final report, that the APGA Board of Directors continue its support of licensure for counselors and that this professional thrust be maintained at a high priority level. (Recommendation IX, Final Report, Special Committee on Credentialing, November 4, 1977).

Counselor Supervisors Opinion of the Strength of the Licensure Movement

In a study conducted under the auspices of the Association of Counselor Educators and Supervisors, and presented by Jones, L. K. at the (1975) APGA meeting in New York, it was stated that, "it is noteworthy that no articles (at the time of the report) have appeared in Counselor Education and Supervision regarding the pros and cons of licensure or the experiences of states that have taken this step" (Jones, 1975). Although many writers (e.g., Morgan, 1974; Sturdevant, 1975; Sweeney, 1975; Witmer, 1975) have expressed concern over the licensing dilemma, particularly the monopolization and control psychologists have both over licensing boards and licensing legislation, this concern does not seem to exist among counselor educators. In response to the question of licensure in the Jones' study, the "movement" toward licensure according to state (and territorial) supervisors appears to be relatively weak. Only 16.6% of the states actually anticipate being involved in the licensure movement, according to state supervisors of guidance (see Table 1).

TABLE 1

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR STATE SUPERVISORS RESPONSES TO LICENSING QUESTION*

Choices	fa	%
a. Guidance counselors are currently being licensed	4	9.5
b. Strong movement to institute licensing likely to succeed within next three years	3	7.1
c. Strong movement, unlikely to succeed in foreseeable future (3-5 years)	9	0.0
d. Weak movement, unlikely to become a significant force in the foreseeable future	10	23.8
e. No movement to institute licensing	25	59.5

[a]One response did not answer.

*This table was taken from a study by Lawrence K. Jones titled, U.S. Counselor Education Programs: Nature, Numbers CBE, Traditional and Nontraditional and presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Personnel and Guidance Association (31st, New York, March 23-36, 1975, page 16).

Some speculation on why the issue of licensure is seen as a relatively weak movement by state supervisors seems necessary. The movement does not seem weak to me, as a researcher. The national network of APGA, the current increase in the amount of research on the subject, and the increased number of court cases over the issue all seem to contradict the response of state supervisors in the Jones (1975) study. Is there an explanation of why state supervisors see the movement as a weak one? One reason for this view may be in the fact that the development and orientation of this group has been in

educational settings. Educational settings throughout the 50 states have well established certification procedures. If one is looking at certification and licensing as mutually exclusive credentialing procedures, or if one merely views certification as the only option open, it is easy to see how the view of the licensing movement could be seen as a weak one. However, if one perceives licensing and certification as compatible parts of a total credentialing program, then I believe the response would have been different. This point may raise another problem, and it is that there seems to be a large amount of confusion surrounding the licensure movement. The courts and the federal government have played a role in the licensure issue, and their role in the licensure issue is the next topic of this paper.

Role of the Federal Government

Over the last decade there has been an ever increasing interest in licensing shown by the Federal Government. Green (1969) found that during the past quarter century the number of professions, skilled trades, and even semi-skilled jobs in which workers must demonstrate competency to the satisfaction of the state, has doubled. There are almost 2,800 statutory provisions that require occupational licensing throughout the country.

The growing interest of the federal government and its various departments over the last ten years can be seen by the actions its various branches have taken. On July 1, 1970, federal law required any state seeking federal funds under the Medicaid Act to have a licensing law for nursing home administrators. This was the first time the federal government has statutorily required the licensing

of any occupation. On June 5, 1974, a bill (S. 3585) was introduced to the U.S. Senate providing that the federal government develop and establish national standards for the licensing of physicians and dentists and prepare appropriate examinations for the initial licensing. Although the bill was not passed, it does demonstrate the growing interest in licensure by the federal government.

The U.S. Department of Labor is interested in the subject of licensing as a barrier to a flexible and mobile labor market. The Federal Trade Commission and the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) have also become involved in occupational licensure. F.T.C. is concerned with self-regulation tendencies of licensing boards and is focusing on these tendencies as a possible restraint on trade. Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) has been concerned with licensing tests and the educational requisites for an occupational license rather than licensing as a whole. The role of the courts in the licensure issue has been just as dramatic as the position the federal government has taken. The next topic of this study will illustrate the important position that the courts have taken with regard to licensure.

The Role of the Courts

The concept of occupational licensing has been challenged in the U.S. Supreme Court as a violation of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution which guarantees each individual due process of the law.

Griggs vs. Duke (1971) was a case that may have some impact on testing in the licensure context. "In this case the court found that certain tests given by an employer to determine the job eligibility

were discriminatory and unlawful. The court pointed out that tests had to be job-related and that credentials should not become a master of reality"(Mackin, 1976).

Weldon vs. Virginia State Board of psychologists Examiners was a case in which a "district court judge ruled that counseling and guidance is a separate profession, i.e., requiring regulation separate from psychology" (Sweeney, 1977).

With both these rulings in mind, can it be deduced that the courts will allow counselors in the future to establish their own licensing boards separate from psychology because it is a separate profession and because of the discriminatory nature of psychology licensing boards? Most literature indicates the courts will not go in the direction of separate licensing boards for counselors.

Gibson vs. Berryhill (1973) was an important case in Alabama because it demonstrated the court's willingness to analyze the realities of the licensing situation. "Even though the case was returned to the lower court for consideration, the court agreed with a previous ruling that the board was so biased that it could not constitutionally proceed against the optometrists" (Gibson vs. Berryhill; Mackin, 1976). In the case mentioned a group of licensed optometrists sought to prevent charges against them by the Alabama Board of Optometry because they stated that they would be constitutionally deprived of their right to practice since the Board was biased and it could not provide them with a fair and an impartial hearing in conformity with due process of law. The court agreed to the extent that it listened to the case and returned it to the lower courts for consideration (Makin, 1976).

In a court case in Ohio (Ohio State Board of Psychology vs. Cook, 1975) a judge reaffirmed the rights of competent counselors, when he dismissed the charges of a board of psychology brought against a trained person who was not a licensed psychologist. Another case still under appeal by the Board of Examiners in Psychology in Mississippi concerns their denial of a doctoral trained person in counseling to take the state examination. The court directed the Board to license the person without examination because of inconsistencies in the Board's practices.

The most recent licensing victory reported in Guide Post (March 2, 1978, page 3) comes out of Wisconsin. The Wisconsin licensing statute was written in 1969 and the Licensing Board's distinction between clinical and educational psychology programs was not in the statute, but was imposed by the rule-making authority of the board. The board generally withheld a license from anyone whose doctorate did not come from a program that had the "clinical" designation of the A.P.A. After a strong lobbying effort by both counselors and psychologists, a Senate committee resolution passed the licensing statute in Spring of 1977. However, the board ignored the resolution and continued to turn down applicants by their old rules. On October 14, 1977, a psychologist named Quentin Shenk, who was being denied a license, sought and received from the Dade County District Court a write of mandamus directing the board to give him a license. A few days after the court decision, legislation was passed suspending the rules of the board.

The Role of the A.P.G.A.

Thomas J. Sweeney (1977) states that the A.P.G.A. adopted a position "in favor of vigorous, responsible action to establish provisions

for the licensure of professional counselors in the various states." Following the spirit of the times, the APGA organized the APGA Commission on Counselor Licensure. The Commission completed four major tasks:

a. It developed tentative guidelines for licensure legislation,

b. responded to hundreds of inquiries concerning the predicaments of members affected by state and federal legislation or regulations,

c. conducted workshops on licensure,

d. and prepared educative materials for the membership. (Sweeney, 1977, p. 594)

A.P.G.A.'s Special Committee for Credentialing

The Commission on Counselor Licensure President, Norman Gysbers', (July 1977) charge to the four member Special Committee was to

> ". . . undertake a full review of the Association's activities with respect to: (a) Standards for Preparation, (b) Implementation of Standards, (c) Licensure/Registry, (d) Regional Institution and Program Accreditation, (e) NCATE/AOTE, and (f) any other related matters . . . and make recommendations to the Board and/or Senate with respect to the most useful courses of action the Association and its Divisions might take in these matters"

(Final Report, A.P.G.A. Special Committee for Credentialing, November 4, 1977). (See Appendix D for a complete copy of this report.)

Present Credentialing System

There already exist six means by which counselors can receive a form of credentialing without state or federal legislation, although only a small minority of counselors would meet the criteria of these forms of credentialing. The six means by which counselors can be credentialed are listed below.

1. American Association for Marriage and Family Counselors (AAMFC) is one form of credentialing. The AAMFC requires 1,000 hours of experience and 200 hours of supervision in marriage and family counseling for clinical members.

2. The Commission on Rehabilitation and Counselor Certification credentials rehabilitation counselors in states where there is an absence of state legislation. Rehabilitation counselors have established a national certification process. The Commission administers a practice-based examination for competency. The process of certification involves the use of supervisor and peer evaluations to supplement the evaluation. There are also minimum academic and years of rehabilitation counseling experience requirements. The Commission also is involved in accreditation of counselor training.

3. The American Association of Sex Educators and Counselors (AASEC) is a form of national certification. There are education and experience requirements which are required for certification. Most counselors would not qualify for certification without additional training. (See Appendix I.)

4. The International Transactional Analysis Association (ITTA) has its own training program and a form of national certification.

5. A fifth form of national credentialing open to psychologists but not to counselors is a national register. This is the National Register of Health Service Providers in Psychology. The Register is primarily a list of doctoral trained psychologists (now more than 8,000) who are licensed or certified for independent practice of psychology, have been trained in a program essentially psychological in nature, and have supervised experience in mental health.

6. A sixth form of national credentialing is a plan proposed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (U.S. Department of HEW, 1976). The proposal presents a national non-federal system of credentialing for health manpower, including counselors. This credentialing body would supersede the state legislation credentialing processes as a means of identifying health providers. If an acceptable form of certification does not exist it would be difficult if not impossible for counselors trying to secure positions in agencies that require insurance payments. (Sweeney & Witmer, 1977, p. 591)

It may be interesting to note that the organization of practitioners called the American Association of Marriage and Family Counselors (AAMFC) recently asked to be recognized by the U.S. Office of Education as the official accrediting agency for evaluating programs in marriage and

family counseling. As reported in the Guide Post ("Commissioner's Advisors Query Experts," 1977), the Office of Education has appointed a panel to study the AAMFC request (Forster, 1978).

Implications of a Tennessee Counselor Licensing Law

The implications for supporting a counselor licensing law in the state of Tennessee are clear. First, among these is the questionable practices of persons allegedly qualified to offer counseling services to the public, will be more closely controlled. Individuals will be stopped from practicing if necessary. Secondly, potentially more services can be made available at less cost to the public. Third, more counseling services can be available in geographical areas not typically served by other counseling related professions. Fourth, different areas of social need not typically served by other professions (e.g., mid-life career or retirement counseling) can be served by professional counselors. Finally, qualified counselors will be employable for areas in which they have special competence without hindrance by statutes of other professional groups (Sweeney & Witmer, 1976).

SECTION THREE

METHODOLOGY

The first task in beginning this survey was to review literature on the subject of licensure, and initially this seemed like no small task since the literature on the subject appeared limited and finding that material looked like a menacing job. The entire June 1976 issue of the Personnel and Guidance Journal was dedicated to the issue of licensing, so a review of literature began here. The most difficult part of doing research, it is believed, is starting. After beginning the review, the subject of licensing began to look like a manageable task.

ERIC Search

The second step was to survey the ERIC documents on the subject of the licensure dilemma. This search focused primarily on five professional journals, and both published and unpublished research on microfilm in ERIC. The five published journals of primary interest and those searched first were the Personnel and Guidance Journal, Counseling Psychologist, School Counselor, Counselor Education and Supervision, and the American Psychologist, published prior to 1972. The ERIC manual search was productive, but it was believed an official data bank search by ERIC would turn up additional sources missed in the manual search.

One serious reservation regarding an official data search by ERIC was that the key term, licensure, was not among those in the ERIC data bank. After speaking with Jane Knight, the Peabody education reference librarian, who assured me that the specific "Licensure" term was not important, as synonymous terms could be found, the ERIC data search was initiated. Examples of synonymous and relative terms used were credentialing, counselor certification, counselor evaluation, program accreditation. Since cross referencing are done by ERIC, additional terms such as court cases, litigation were also used. (See Appendix G, which contains a complete copy of the ERIC search.)

Correspondence

Several letters were written to researchers in the field and members of licensure commission. Two contributing researchers to the Personnel and Guidance Journal special issue (June 1976) previously mentioned were contacted. Ms. Fredrica Halligan, of Yale University, who is studying the licensure issue as it affects para-professionals, and Dr. Marguerite R. Carroll, of Fairfield University, who is also a member of the Licensure Commission, were contacted.

Dr. Carroll responded with a complete copy of her research on the "Current Status and Opinionaire of ACES Members Concerning Licensure Requirements." Dr. Carroll also provided the names of other members of the licensure committee who would be helpful to my study. I wrote one of the committee members she mentioned, Dr. Jane O'Hern, for copies of two important committee reports. One is titled, Model for State Legislation Concerning the Practice of Counseling, 1976, Rough Draft #14, and another report produced by a sub-committee titled Rationale for

Counselor Licensure. As of yet, I have not received these valuable sources.

Interview

Dr. Linda Rudolph of Austin Peay University was also contacted. Dr. Rudolph is the State Coordinator for the State of Tennessee and a part of the APGA licensure network. (See Appendix A.) An interview was scheduled with Dr. Rudolph upon her return from the APGA convention on April 3, 1978. The purpose of this interview was to collect additional materials and gain first hand information on the activities of the counseling movement in Tennessee.

All of the previous mentioned activities--Literature Review, ERIC Search, Correspondence, and Interview--assisted me in the conceptualization of the survey questionnaire and in understanding the credentialing dilemma.

Survey Population

The term survey population is used here because the opinions of HDC students are the aggregate objects being examined. No inferences will be made beyond this group to a larger group of counselors. The opinions of the HDC students represent the parameters of the survey. Since a sample represents any sub-aggregate opinions drawn from a population, it would be an error to refer to HDC student opinions as a survey sample. They represent the aggregate body being examined. Thus they represent the survey population.

The population selected for this study were counselors in the HDC program at Peabody.

> The term 'counselor' has been used by many groups to designate individuals performing various functions. Herein 'counselor' is used to represent people who possess professional knowledge, demonstrable personal intervention skills, and attitudes and values consonant with a code of ethics . . . for purposes of this study 'counselors' are professionals who should be recognized for being competent without being encapsulated by further qualification, such as educator, psychologist, or mental health workers (Final Report, APGA Special Committee for Credentialing, November 4, 1977).

No control was desired with respect to degree level, work setting, or work experience. The counselor population is expected to have a great deal of diversity. This diversity in the population will do more to confirm the results of the survey than invalidate them because counselors as a group seem to be rather diverse in background and interests. There will be no attempts to isolate a particular group of counselors (e.g., secondary school, drug, corrections, etc.) because this would reduce the size of the results and thus dilute those same results. No attempt was made to generalize beyond the student population being studied.

It was believed that the identifying information on the front of the questionnaire would allow for the isolation of responses with regard to specific variables (i.e., how do female counselors respond as opposed to males, or, how do counselors over the age of 40 respond as opposed to those under 30?, etc.). So, although the total response desired was from a broad population, it was hoped that insights could be made by examining, comparing and isolating results by common characteristics. However, the limited response rate did not permit this type of analysis.

Survey

In constructing the questionnaire some basic guidelines were followed. An attempt was made to keep the length of the questionnaire down to one or two pages. The typed questionnaire was made to fit comfortably on one page front-and-back. (See Appendix F for a complete copy of the correspondence--including survey--sent to HDC students.) An attempt was also made to keep the appearance of the questionnaire and the method of responding simple, to encourage completion. These considerations were expected to increase the response rate. The response alternatives were designed in a way to avoid the "central-tendency" concept. That is, the tendency of people to avoid taking an extreme stand and to choose the "middle" answer on a question. All responses used to support or reject the question (except one) are Agree, Disagree, and Undecided. Question eleven is a rank order response, and it was used to determine the credentialing preference of respondents. Questions one through six were designed to provide identifying information. Information that would help in profiling the HDC student is contained in the questions remaining.

Survey Distribution and Response Rate

An attempt was made to survey all Human Development Counseling students. A list of student names and addresses was obtained from the HDC program area office. The surveys were distributed through campus mail boxes for Track I students, and mailed directly to the home addresses of Track II students. Each survey contained a cover letter, a copy of the survey, and one self-addressed (my address) stamped envelope in which it was hoped students would return their responses.

It was hoped that the stamped envelope would add a small degree of importance to the survey and possibly increase the response rate by increasing the ease of responding. Unfortunately it did not. The return rate was a disappointing 48.5% for Track I students, 26.9% for Track II students, and 38.9% overall. A number of reasons for this weak return rate could be offered. Suffice it to say that the poor response rate may be indicative of the diversity of opinion, apathy, and general ignorance among counselors surrounding the issue of licensure. Gross (1977) articulated some of the reservations when he identified many negative aspects of licensing, including the "exclusive club mentality" it promotes. Other members, many of whom are relatively happy with their current situation, may view changes in credentialing as being potentially disruptive of their careers. For these and others, involvement in efforts for change is only stimulated by threat to the status quo or by clear visions of ways it could be better (Forster, 1978).

Three weeks following the distribution of the questionnaire the responses were tallied. The questionnaires were distributed on April 25, 1978, and tallied on May 16, 1978. Time limitations did not permit results received after May 22, 1978, to be included in the survey tally. Only one response was received after this date.

A total of 59 questionnaires were distributed to both Track I and Track II students. Thirty-three of the 59 questionnaires were sent to Track I students and twenty-six to Track II students. Sixteen responses were returned by Track I students. The chart below shows the percentage of responses from both Track I and Track II students. Since only two questionnaires were returned unopened, and marked "address unknown," it is assumed the other 57 questionnaires were received.

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGE RATE OF RESPONSE

	Questionnaires Distributed	Questionnaires Returned	Percentage of Response
Track I	33	16*	48.5*
Track II	26	7*	26.9*
Total	59	23	38.9

*One survey from a Track I student and one survey from a Track II student were returned marked "address unknown."

Track II Responses

As a result of the small number (seven) of Track II students responding to the survey it was decided not to incorporate those responses into the main body of the survey. It was believed that seven responses would not represent the opinions of approximately 26 Track II students. Combining the results of both Track I and II students was considered, but the idea was quickly dismissed because of the diverse nature of the two programs. The responses of the Track II students were tallied and placed in Appendix H.

Identifying Information

The first six questions on the survey requested preliminary identifying information. This information included questions about the student's official title (if employed), desired area of specialization, degree level, involvement in both local, state and national professional organizations. The surveys completed by Track I students indicated

that responses were evenly divided between males and females. Eight students completing the survey were married, seven were single. One female student did not include her age or marital status, so this data was not included when averages were compiled. The average age of male students completing the survey was exactly 32.0 years of age. The average age of female students completing the survey was 33.6 years.

TABLE 3

RESPONDENTS

Average Age	33.6 Female	32.0 Male
Marital Status	7 Single	8 Married
Sex	8 Female	8 Male

Respondents' Degree Level

Students responding to the survey came from all three of the Human Development Counseling degree levels. Three students were at the M.S. level, six at the Ed.S. level, and seven at the Ed.D. level.

Direction of Students

Five of the 16 Track I students responding to the questionnaire indicated that they were employed. The students that were employed were not employed in--what they considered--their desired area of specialization.

Seven of the 16 graduate students responding identified either higher education or psychotherapy as their desired areas of specialization. (See Table 4 for responses to desired area of specialization.)

TABLE 4

RESPONSES GIVEN TO DESIRED AREA OF SPECIALIZATION

Number of Students	Area of Specialization
4	Higher Education or Community College
3	Psychotherapy or Family Therapy
2	Community Psychology (C.M.H.C.)
	Adult Development
	Secondary Schools
	Sports Psychology
	Child Care
	Corrections
	Clinical Education

Method Used to Analyze Results

In much of todays research the results take on a role of secondary importance to the statistical method in which those results are analyzed. Here, I have tried to consciously avoid creating questions of statistical significance which would take precedence over the real-life questions being asked.

> seemingly obsessed with statistical method and so-called objectivity of data and figures full of tests of significance signifying nothing, because behind the numbers often lies nothing more than answers to ambiguous questions, or observed behaviors whose meaning is unclear. Complex statistical work sometimes masks the essential triviality or ambiguity of questionnaire responses or ratings and observations. (Goldman, 1976, p. 544)

The results of the study are expressed in percentages and raw numbers, i.e., three students (18.7%) were undecided as to whether all counselors not certified should be credentialed in some other way. The results expressed in this way clearly represent the opinions of

the students being studied. If these responses were coded, run through a computer with the results carried out to several decimal points, and then examined in terms of their deviation from the mean and their level of significance they would be not more the clearer. In fact I feel the reality of the results would be more abstract, less clear, less understandable, and less valuable.

> When using personality inventories or attitude scales, for example, we just are not dealing with the kinds of realities that justify all that attempted percision. (Goldman, 1976, p. 545)

SECTION FOUR

RESULTS

Section Four is the heart of this project and discusses the results of the survey and confirms whether those results support or reject the three major questions. The three topics included in this section are: (a) Support for Credentialing, (b) Accreditation, and (c) Professional Identity.

Major Question One

The first question of the study states:

> Does broad support exist for licensing as a form of credentialing among graduate student counselors in the HDC program at George Peabody College.

Survey responses 7, 8, and 9 are designed to answer this question. The survey questions and their responses can be seen below.

Major Question One

Support for Licensure

7. I am aware of the licensing issue for counselors as a form of credentialing presently being studied within A.P.G.A.

Yes	No
11	5
68.7%	31.3%

8. I would support a licensing law for counselors in the State of Tennessee.

Agree	Disagree	Undecided
13	0	3
81%		19%

9. If a licensing law were passed for counselors, and I qualified, I would apply for a license.

Agree	Disagree	Undecided
13	1	1
81%	6.3%	6.3% *

*One response to question nine was returned marked not applicable. It is assumed that this response was given because the student does not work as a counselor.

In response to the first major question, it can be said that support for licensure within the HDC program is strong, 81% (13) of those students responding said they would support a licensing law (question 8 for counselors in the state of Tennessee). Although 19% (3 students) said they were undecided, no one said they would not support a licensing law for counselors. Eighty-one percent of those students responding also said they would apply for licensure, if a licensure law did exist and they qualified (question 9). Only one student (6.3%) would not apply for licensure, another (6.3%) was undecided, and still another (6.3%) did not think the question applicable to her.

Over 68% (11 students) of those responding felt they were aware of the licensure issue within the ranks of the APGA, while 31.5% (5 students) felt they were not fully aware of this issue, although only three students (19.9%) are members of that organization.

In conclusion it can be said that there is both a high level of awareness surrounding the licnesure issue (68.7%) and an extremely high level of support (81%) for a licensure law among Peabody HDC counseling students. The first major question which asks, "Does

broad support exist for licensing as a form of credentialing," should be answered, yes.

Although the audience for this survey, as mentioned, was a group of Peabody graduate (HDC) students and not a statewide counseling audience, Dr. Rudolph informed me that the answers to the above questions from a statewide population of counselors would be extremely valuable to her in her work as the APGA licensure representative for the state.

Major Question Two

Licensing as a form of credentialing is a recent term to most counselors. Historically, credentialing has come in the form of certification. Do counselors in the Human Development Counseling program at Peabody prefer program accreditation over other forms of credentialing? And what forms of credentialing are most preferred: certification, licensure, or program accreditation? These are the questions which survey responses 10 and 12 hope to resolve, and the questions around which question two was developed.

Major Question Two-A is stated as:

> Does broad support exist for A.P.G.A. institutional program accreditation among graduate student counselors in the HDC program at George Peabody College?

The survey questions and their responses can be seen below.

Major Question Two-A

Program Accreditation

		Agree	Disagree	Undecided
10.	I believe all counselors not certified should be credentialed by (a) licensure, or (b) program accreditation.	12 75%	1 6.3%	3 18.7%
12.	I believe that once a counselor graduates from an accredited university program no other credentialing procedure should be required.	4 25%	10 62.5%	2 12.5%

The results of question ten almost duplicated those of question eight and nine. The results to question ten indicated that students strongly supported credentialing in the form of (a) licensure or (b) program accreditation as a form of credentialing. Seventy-five percent of those responding indicated that counselors who are not certified should be credentialed either by licensure or program accreditation. The results of this question indicate that of those students responding, there was strong support for the concept of credentialing. Only one student (6.3%) disagreed and three students (18.7%) were undecided about credentialing via program accreditation or licensure.

The follow-up to question number 10 was question twelve. The results to this question further refine the responses given to question number ten. This is to say that although students favor the concept of credentialing counselors--they felt that credentialing through accreditation is not enough. Over 62% (10 students) of those responding do not feel that graduating from an accredited university program is enough. Although 25% did agree with the statement that "no other credentialing procedure should be required," the larger majority either disagree (62.5%) or were undecided (12.5%). As a result of the responses to both questions ten and twelve, it is safe to conclude that while there is some support for credentialing, most students do not feel that credentialing in the form of program accreditation alone is enough.

Major Question Two-B

A corollary to Question Two-A is Two-B. This is an important "follow-up" question to question two-a because it tries to answer a second question. The second major question being:

"What is the most preferred method of credentialing among the three alternatives being examined--licensure, program accreditation, and certification. Please see the question and the given responses below.

Major Question Two-B

Order of Preference

			Responses		
11. I prefer the following method or methods as the best form/s of credentialing. (Please rank (1-2-3-4) your preferred response or responses.)	1. Licensure		1st	2nd	3rd
	2. Program Accreditation		8	4	1
	3. Certification		4	2	7
	4. None of the above		3	5	3
	5. All of the above				

Question eleven tried to determine what forms of credentialing are the most and least favored among the three being studied. Participants were asked to rank order their response to question eleven indicating which type (if any) they most preferred by indicating a one, then indicate their second choice by marking a two, and so on. Some students did not follow this procedure and ordered their responses in answering the question. A few students checked only their most preferred response, others marked only their first or second choice. As a result not all sixteen responses could be considered.

In the chart below responses were weighted so comparisons could be made. A three value was given for first choice responses, two for second, and one for third.

	Weighted Responses			Weighted Total
	1st Choice	2nd Choice	3rd Choice	
1. Licensure	8x3=24	4x2=8	1x1=1	33
2. Program Accreditation	4x3=12	2x2=4	7x1=7	23
3. Certification	3x3=9	5x2=10	3x1=3	22

As can be seen in the chart above, licensure ranks first as the most preferred form of credentialing. Program accreditation and certification are a distant second and third choice respectively.

Major Question Three-A

Major Question Three-A states:

> A need exists for counselors in the HDC graduate program at Peabody to clearly differentiate the specific functions of counselors as distinguished from other mental health professionals.

Questions seventeen and eighteen of the survey are designed to resolve question three-a. Please see questions and responses below.

Major Question Three-A

Specific Functions

		Agree	Disagree	Undecided
17.	I believe that there is a real need to clearly define the specific functions of counselors; to reduce confusion over the counselor's role.	11 68.8%	3 18.7%	2 12.5%
18.	I believe the activities of most counselors are not clearly understood by non-counselors in my work setting.	7 43.7%	3 18.7%	3 18.7%

In response to questions seventeen and eighteen (shown above), it can be concluded that most HDC students do feel that there is a need to better define the role of the counselor to reduce role confusion (question 17). Over 68% of the students responding to question seventeen agree that there is a real need "to clearly define the specific functions of the counselor to reduce confusion over the counselor's role." Only three (18.7%) students disagreed with the statement while two were undecided. The response to question eighteen was less definitive. Only 43.7% agreed that "the activities of most counselors are

not clearly understood by non-counselors in their work setting." It was expected that the results to questions seventeen and eighteen would compliment one another.

One reason can be offered for the differences in the response to the two questions which were very similar in nature. The second question (question 18) assumes the respondent is working or functions in some kind of work setting by the phrase "in my work setting." This phrase should have been dropped from the sentence but it was not.

Although students were encouraged to respond to all questions, three students chose not to respond to question eighteen. I believe this lack of response was largely due to the fact that the question assumed the responder had a work setting. Even with this lack of response it can be said that there is a moderate degree of support for the statement that the activities of most counselors are not clearly understood by others.

In regard to question three-a, it can be concluded that most students support the hypothesis that "A need exists for counselors to clearly differentiate the specific functions of the counselor from other mental health professions."

Major Question Three-B

Major Question Three-B is a corollary to Question Three-A and states:

> Do counselors need to clearly define the philosophical base of their counseling profession?

This question may seem misplaced, but it is not. There has been a recurring theme in the literature that goes like this,

> The counselor's methods or processes, most of which have been heavily influenced by a combination of humanistic and behavior philosophy, are based on a belief that each individual has the capacity and potential for growth and self-control. A large number of practitioners and recipients have experienced the counseling process and recognizes its unique value. Thus there is a desire among practitioners to define the process more carefully and to legitimize it as society becomes more complex, institutionalized, and legalistic in character. (Forster, 1977)

This idea has been expressed by others (Arbuckle, 1977; Sweeney & Witmer, 1977).

Questions thirteen, fourteen, fifteen, and sixteen of the survey are designed to resolve major question three-B.

Major Question Three-B

Philosophy

		Agree	Disagree	Undecided
13.	I believe all counselors work from some kind of basic theory or philosophy.	9 56%	5 31%	2 13%
14.	I believe a counselor can be effective without a philosophical base.	Agree 1 6%	Disagree 12 75%	Undecided 3 19%
15.	I believe most counselors have absolutely no philosophy upon which they base their activities.	Agree 1 6%	Disagree 12 75%	Undecided 3 19%
16.*	My supervisor understands my role as a counselor.	Agree 11 69%	Disagree 1 6%	Undecided 0

*This question was left blank by two respondents.

In response to questions fourteen and fifteen it can be said that most students strongly believe (75%) that a counselor needs to work from a philosophical base to be effective and students believe (75%) that most counselors do have a philosophy upon which they base their activities. Students disagreed by 75% with statements fourteen and

fifteen--that a counselor can be effective without a philosophy and that most counselors have absolutely no philosophy upon which to base their activities--and three were undecided.

Although students believed that most counselors have a philosophy upon which they base their activities, they were less willing (56%) to believe that all counselors work from some kind of basic theory or philosophy.

With respect to major question three-B it can be concluded that the HDC students believe that effective counselors do need to have a clearly defined philosophical base for their counseling activities. The hypothesis is strongly supported.

SECTION FIVE

CONCLUSIONS

To conclude this survey with neatly stated findings seems inappropriate for several reasons. First among these is the poor response rate; because the response rate was limited and only 48.5% of all Track I HDC students responded, the survey seems incomplete to me. What do the other 51.5% of the students think? Would their responses have significantly changed the results? The poor response rate makes the results of this study highly suspect in my mind. Secondly, but of less direct significance to the study, is the personal disappointment associated with the response rate. I did not believe that three weeks after I sent out the questionnaire, only twelve students had responded. I had hoped to start tallying the responses after two weeks of distribution but began the tally after three weeks and after it was clear to me that the element of time was not a factor. Many surveys would not be returned regardless of how long I waited. The response rate, I am sure, subtly changed my perspective, enthusiasm, and the way I wrote the project. Keeping these limitations in mind, the following conclusions are offered.

From a review of the literature it seems that the real solution to the licensure dilemma for counselors may come through the courts. The number of state legislatures moving to remedy the restrictive practices of psychology licensing boards are few. The number of states that have

recognized and defined counseling in the form of legislation are even fewer. The lobbying efforts against such changes are strong. The results of these strong lobbying efforts against legislative changes suggests that the courts may provide the swiftest and surest remedy for counselors. The solution to the licensing problems for counselors may be found in the courts.

The role of the APGA in this matter may be more effective if their emphasis was changed initially from one of lobbying (for legislative changes) to one of legal advisement and selection of specific unfair practices by psychology licensing boards which should be challenged in the courts. In this way APGA could assist in moving the arena of discussion about licensing from the legislative chambers to the courts. Although it is possible that the courts could be negative and even less responsive than the state legislatures, if past court cases are any indication it is doubtful that this would happen in all 50 states.

Concerning the results of the survey specifically, it can be said that HDC students strongly support the concept of licensing for counselors. All but three students indicated that they would apply for a license if such a law existed. Although HDC students support a licensing method for counselors, their strong identification with more traditional disciplines vis-a-vis counseling raises some questions. "Do HDC students support the concept of licensing for counselors in a specialized manner or is their support one of a general nature for all counseling professionals?" "Do they view counselor licensure in a generic way?" For example, do HDC students prefer licensure for marriage counselors, as a separate process from licensure for rehabilitation

counselors? This question and many others have not been answered, and there is room for more research in this area.

Although only three students were members of APGA, 68% of the students responding felt they were aware of the licensure issue within APGA. A higher level of student participation in APGA was expected.

Seventy-five percent of the HDC students indicated that counselors should be credentialed, if not through certification, then in some other way, i.e., licensure, certification. Licensure, program accreditation, and certification were indicated by students as their order of preference of the elements which make up credentialing. This order of preference is supported by the students' responses to their desired area of specialization. The fact that there was little interest in the public schools coincides with the limited interest in certification, the traditional form of credentialing for public schools.

Over 68% of the HDC students felt that there is a need to better define the role of the counselor to reduce role confusion. This response was supported by the belief (43.7%) that the activities of most counselors are not clearly understood by non-counselors in their work setting. Could these results suggest that if the counselor's role is not clearly understood by others, then counselors need to communicate more with those they work?

Seventy-five percent of the HDC students believe that counselors need and have a philosophical base from which to work. Only 56% of the students would go so far as to say that all counselors work from some kind of basic theory. The need for a solid philosophy seems certain, to HDC students.

Similar Conclusions

The genesis for this survey came in an article by Jerald Forster titled "What shall we do about credentialing," the June 1977 publication of the Personnel and Guidance Journal. In that article, the writer focused on four issues. Three of those issues were presented to HDC students in the form of the following key questions:

1. Is there broad support for additional credentialing practices within the counseling profession?

2. Does the counseling profession need a clearer identity with an identified philosophical base and designation of specific functions?

3. Does the counseling profession want to stress licensure as its main credentialing thrust?

These issues were addressed directly to the HDC students. HDC student responses to these questions are contained within section four, along with an analysis of those results.

In a second follow-up article by Forster, (Counselor Credentialing Revisited, 1978) he answers the questions previously posed. It seems important to me that a review of his conclusions in light of the results of this survey makes for an interesting comparison of results.

In response to the first question, Forster seems to believe that there is support for credentialing but this support and interest must be tapped and awareness levels of counselors raised. He states:

> there obviously are many APGA members who are neither interested nor supportive of credentialing-related activities . . . . Despite the absence of alarm in the general membership, there are enough signs of activity to say that broad support is there to be tapped. If this support is to be tapped, continued attention must be devoted to publicity and to the education of counselors concerning the implications of credentialing practices for their professional survival. (p. 594)

In response to question two, Forster seems to believe that there has been a lack of identity in the movement toward credentialing, which has resulted in a disjointed movement. Disjointed between specialized credentialing by problem or work setting (American Association of Marriage and Family Counselors, Rehabilitation Counselors, American Association of Sex Educators and Counselors) and a generalized counselor credential. Forster loyalties seem to be with a generalized form of credentialing. He states:

> A holistic, humanistic philosophy provides the most powerful rationale, in that individuals are regarded as total persons whose problems can not be isolated from each other and compartmentalized for treatment in four or five different settings. It is proposed that in the long run, counseling will become a more powerful social service if its identity is tied to a generic model that transcends specific problem areas of service-delivery settings. (Forster, 1978, p. 596)

In response to question three, it is stated that, "The profession does wish to make licensure its main thrust in its credentialing efforts. Although the price will be higher and the prospects less predictable, the payoff of greater legitimacy in a wider variety of settings should justify the price" (Forster, 1978). The results of the survey among HDC students reflect very similar conclusions. Although the underlying causes for the attitudes reflected by HDC students, I feel, are different from those of the general APGA population of which Forster (1978) speaks; never-the-less the conclusions drawn are similar.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. American Personnel and Guidance Association. Position Statement on Counselor Licensure. Washington, D.C., APGA, 1975.

2. Dragan, J. W. Counselor Certification--Panacea or Placebo? Paper presented at Canadian Guidance and Counseling Association Convention, Toronto, May 30-June 2, 1971.

3. Glenne, R. E. Ethical and legal responsibilities of Counselors. Paper presented at the 19th Annual Meeting of the Nevada Personnel and Guidance Association, Stateline, Nevada, November 13-15, 1974.

4. Jones, L. K. U.S. counselor education programs: Nature, numbers, CBE, traditional and nontraditional. A report of the Commission on Counselor Education Program and Enrollment Characteristics of the Association of Counselor Education and Supervision. Paper presented at the 31st Annual Meeting of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, New York, March 23-26, 1975.

5. Morgan, J. I. Licensure: The challenge to counseling practitioners. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, Chicago, Ill., April 11-14, 1976.

6. Robinson, Richard T. Legislative Guidelines for the Professionalization of School Counselors. Paper presented at American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention, Atlantic City, N.J., April 4-8, 1971.

7. Sparacio, Richard T. Credentialing Survey of Human Development Counseling Students Attitudes Toward Licensure, Program Accreditation and Professional Identity. Project proposal. April 1978.

8. Sweeney, T. J., Vogel, F. J. Certification and Licensure. EDRS Speech, 1973.

REFERENCES

Albee, G. W. To thine own self be true. American Psychologist, 1975, 30, 1156-1158.

American Psychological Association. A model for state legislation affecting the practice of psychology 1967: Report of APA Committee on Legislation. American Psychologist, 1967, 22, 1095-1103.

Arbuckle, D. S. Counselor licensure: To be or not to be. Personnel and Guidance Journal, June 1977, pp. 581-585.

Asher, J. Opposition wins latest round in fight over New York licensing bill. APA Monitor, 1973, 4(6), 1.

Brammer, L. M., & Springer, H. C. A radical change in counselor education and certification. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1971, 49, 803-808.

Carroll, M. R., & Halligan, F. G. Current status and opinionnaire of ACES members concerning licensure requirements. Washington, D.C.: ACES, 1976.

Cottingham, H. F. School counselors face the question of licensing. School Counselor, 1975, 22, 255-258.

Cottingham, H. F., & Warner, R. W. A.P.G.A. and Counselor Licensure: A status report. Personnel and Guidance Journal, June 1978, pp. 604-607.

Dash, E. F. Counselor competency and the revised ACES standards. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1975, 14, 221-227.

Duricka, P. Licensing differences discussed. APGA Guidepost, September 23, 1976, p. 1.

Forster, J. R. An introduction to the standards for the preparation of counselors and other personnel services specialists. Personnel and Guidance Journal, June 1977, p. 595.

Forster, J. R. Counselor credentialing revisited. Personnel and Guidance Journal, June 1978, pp. 593-598.

Forster, J. R. What shall we do about credentialing? Personnel and Guidance Journal, June 1977, pp. 573-576.

Goldman, L. A revolution in counseling research. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 543-552.

Goodyear, R. K., & Derner, G. F. Counseling and professional psychology: A dialogue. Personnel and Guidance Journal, June 1978, pp. 599-603.

Gross, S. J. Professional disclosure: An alternative to licensure. Personnel and Guidance Journal, June 1978, pp. 586-588.

Hayes, D. G. We are counselors! Nothing more! Nothing less! School Counselor, 1975, 22, 150-151.

Hayes, G. E. Professional preparation and leisure counseling. Journal of Physical Education and Recreation, 1977, 48(4), 36-38.

Hill, G. E. The profession and standards for counselor education. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1967, 6, 130-136.

Jones, L. K. A national survey of program and enrollment characteristics of counselor education programs. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1976, 15, 166-176.

Lindenburg, S. P. Attention students: Be advised... Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1976, 55, 34-36.

Mackin, P. K. Occupational licensing: A warning. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1976, 54, 507.

Maine Counselors: Privilege statute. APGA Guidepost, 1973, 16 (Extra), 5.

Meltzer, M. L. Insurance reimbursement: A mixed blessing. American Psychologist, 1975, 30, 1150-1164.

Morgan, J. I. Licensing of psychologists and counselors in Florida: An opinion and recommendations. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Counseling and Personnel Services Information Center, January, 1976.

Morgan, James I. Some licensing issues for Florida psychologists and counselors: An opinion and recommendations. Florida Psychologist, 1975, 25(1), 65-67.

Pratt, Richard W. Counselor Licensure and Certification: An ERIC Search for the ERIC/CAPS Advisory Commission. ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Personnel Services, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1975.

Pennsylvania implements liberal licensing law. APA Monitor, 1973, 4, (6), 12.

Sexton, J. M. A reaction to the ASCA statement on policy for secondary school counselors. School Counselor, 1965, 12, 132-135.

Stripling, Robert O. Standards and accreditation in counselor education: A proposal. Personnel and Guidance Journal, June 1978, pp. 608-611.

Swanson, C. D. A case supporting licensure. APGA Guidepost, August 19, 1976, p. 5.

Sweeney, T. J., & Sturdevant, A. D. Licensure in the helping professions: Anatomy of an issue. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1974, 52, 575-580.

Sweeney, T. J., & Witmer, J. M. Who says you're a counselor. Personnel and Guidance Journal, June 1977, pp. 589-594.

VanHoose, W. H., & Pietrofesa, J. J. (Eds.) Counseling and guidance in the twentieth century. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1970.

APPENDIX A

National Licensure Network

NATIONAL LICENSURE NETWORK

Alabama - Donald Schmitz, dean of student affairs, Jacksonville State University, Jacksonville, Ala. 36265; (205) 539-5321.

Arkansas - Ted Richardson, director, Counseling Center, University of Arkansas at Little Rock 32nd and University, Little Rock, Ark. 72204.

California - William Jack Rowley, 6401 Linda Vista Road; San Diego, Calif. 92111; home (714) 368-2854, work (714) 292-3771.

Connecticut - Jo Ann Giaquinto, 80 Cartright St. 8A, Bridgeport, Conn. 06604; home (203) 368-2854, work (203) 261-6943.

Delaware - James D. Wiggins, 131 W. South St., Smyrna, Del. 19977; home (302) 678-5308, work (302) 653-4576.

District of Columbia - Barbara Lee Smith, 1240 Fourth St. S.W., W506, Washington, D. C. 20024; (202) 727-2321

Florida - Paul W. Fitzgerald, 1934 N.W. 42nd Ave., Gainesville, Fla. 32605; home (904) 392-0731.

Georgia - Jannar William Davis, Box 502, 18 W. Broad St., Newnan, Ga. 30263; home (404) 251-0942, work (404) 253-2680.

Idaho - Budd L. Kendrick, Boise Psychological Services, 855 S. Curtis Road, Boise, Idaho 83705; home (208) 376-7406, work (208) 384-2800.

Illinois - Casimir E. Zielinski, Box 123, Department of Counselor Education, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, Ill. 62026; home (618) 656-0307, work (618) 692-3946.

Iowa - William A. Matles, 113 S. Washington Park Road, Iowa City, Iowa 52240; home (319) 351-5344, work (319) 353-5078.

Kansas - M. Donald Modtz, Library Building, 625 Minnisota Kansas City, Kans. 66101; home (913) 299-6349, (913) 621-3073.

Kentucky - Stephen Schnacke, Department of Counselor Education Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, Ky. 42101; (502) 745-4953.

Louisiana - Keith B. Runton, Department of Behavioral Science, Northwestern State University, Natchitoches, La. 71457; home (318) 352-2327, work (318) 357-6485.

Maine - William H. Freudenberger, Gorham High School, 41 Morrill Ave., Gorham, Maine 04038; home (207) 773-6944, work (207) 839-3363.

Maryland - Frank J. Wynne, 1801 Woodlawn Drive, Baltimore, Md. 21207; home (301) 728-4321, work (301) 944-5888.

Michigan - William A. Carlson, counseling and personnel, 3109 Sangren Hall, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Mich. 49008; home (616) 381-7454, work (616) 383-1975.

Minnesota - Sharon Ireland,
7240 York Ave. S. Apt. 514,
Edina, Minn. 55435;
home (512) 831-7361,
work (512) 588-0871.

Mississippi - Anne Marie C. Lanb,
psychologist,
102 Brame Ave.,
West Point, Miss. 38773.

Missouri - Bill Jessee,
counselor education,
University of Missouri
Kansas City, Mo. 64110

Montana - Grady Van Soest,
Eastern Montana College,
Billings, Mont. 59101;
home (406) 245-5438, work
(406) 657-2168.

Nebraska - John Bielke,
1236 S. Andrews Road,
Bellevue, Neb. 68005;
home (412) 291-5566,
work (412) 291-6509.

Nevada - Donald D. Perry,
2684 Sorrel,
Las Vegas, Nev. 89102;
home (702) 876-3598,
work (702) 458-8800.

New Hampshire - Mary Anne Kane,
Dunbar Hall,
Exeter, N.H. 03833;
(603) 778-391.

New Jersey - Edward W. Stroh,
19 Dogwood Trail,
Randolph, N.J. 07801;
home (201) 361-1359,
work (201) 261-4500.

New York - Irma Deborah Godlin,
201 E. 21st St.,
New York, NY 10010
home (212) 475-7981,
work (212) 596-8910.

North Carolina - Patricia Partin,
1808 Wills Ave.,
Raleigh, N.C. 27608;
home (919) 833-6722,
work (919) 876-1473.

Ohio - C. Jane Bartlett,
7037 Noctume Road N.,
Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068;
home (614) 861-4952,
work (614) 864-6050.

Oklahoma - Jim Seals, School
of Applied Behavioral Studies,
Stillwater, Okla. 74074.

Oregon - John Swanson,
2963 Fillmore,
Corvallis, Ore. 97330;
(503) 753-0820.

South Carolina - Thomas Wilson
University Terrace, Apt. 164,
Columbia, S.C. 29201;
home (803) 799-4141,
work (803) 536-7054.

South Dakota - A. Jane Mielke,
500 S. Kiwanis, Apt. 316
Sioux Falls, S.D. 57104;
home (605) 332-6327
work (605) 339-1540.

Tennessee - Linda Rudolph,
Psychology Department,
Austin Peay University,
Clarksville, Tenn. 34040;
home (615) 647-4383
work (615) 648-7233.

Texas - Reba Sommerville,
1203 W. Pioneer Parkway,
Arlington, Tex. 76013;
home (817) 461-9105
work (817) 460-4611.

Utah - Eugene T. Buckner,
C-273 ASB,
Brigham Young University,
Provo, Utah 84602;
home (801) 375-8723,
work (801) 374-1211, ext. 4062.

Virginia - John Weldon,
10354 Warwick Blvd.,
Newport News, Va. 23600;
(804) 596-3447.

West Virginia - Michael Thomas Yura,
Route 1, Box 198,
Maidsville, W. Va. 26541;
home (304) 599-1743,
work (304) 293-3807.

Wisconsin - Sut Elizabeth Spooner,
805 A Anchorage Court (home),
Nursing Education Room 0-2,
University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh,
Oshkosh, Wis. 54901;
home (414) 233-461
work (414) 424-1475.

Wyoming - Donald V. Forrest
Box 3374
University Station
Laramie, Wyo. 82071;
home (307) 742-3356,
work 766-2366.

APPENDIX B

A Draft Proposal for Legislation Regulating Marriage, Family and Child Counselors

A Draft Proposal For Legislation
Regulating Marriage, Family and Child Counselors

Section 1

The purpose of this bill is to provide a system for honest professional disclosure to prospective clients and the registration of these disclosures. This bill does not and will not regulate who can and can not do counseling. Anyone designating themselves as a marriage counselor, family counselor, child counselor, or counselor shall be subject to the provisions of this Article.

Section 2

All individuals subject to this Article shall be required to disclose the following information to any client availing themselves of their service, before any such counseling for which a fee may be charged.

1) Their full and complete name, their business address, and their business phone number;

2) A statement of the counselor's basic philosophy or philosophies of counseling;

3) A listing of their formal education, including a listing of any degrees, institutions attended, and the specific dates and times of their attendance at each institution of higher education;

4) A listing of any additional experience, informal education, or memberships in any professional association that would, in the opinion of the counselor, further qualify the individual for the counseling profession. If a counselor lists any seminars or relevant training under an established counselor, the specific dates and times of these seminars and/or training and the name of such counselors must be listed;

5) The specific fee schedule charged by the counselor for the various services rendered. Such fee schedules shall be listed on an hourly basis, or on a per-visit basis, providing the average length of time for each visit is included with the fee schedule;

6) In addition, a legible statement shall appear at the top of each listing of information which shall read: "This information is required by the Illinois Department of Registration and Education which regulates all marriage, family, child, and professional counselors." Immediately below this statement, there shall appear the Department's Springfield address and a central telephone number within the department to be determined by the Director.

Section 3

All information detailed in Section 2 of this Article must be distributed to each client prior to the commencement of such counseling and must be presented in a legible manner on a printed sheet of paper in a form determined by the Department.

Any individual who presents himself or herself as a marriage counselor, family counselor, child counselor, or counselor and maintains a permanent and central place of business must also post the information required in Section 2 of this Article in a legible and conspicuous manner in such place of business. To be valid, this information must be notarized by a notary public within the previous year. Any substantial change in the posted information shall require a new notarization.

Section 4

One notarized copy of such qualifications must be filed annually with the Department of Registration and Education and must be available for public inspection upon request from the Department. No substantive change may be made in a counselor's statement without the Department receiving an updated notarized copy of the statement. The Department is authorized to promulgate a standardized form for the disclosure of the required information under Section 2.

Section 5

If any individual presents himself or herself as a marriage counselor, family counselor, child counselor, or counselor and employs, or directly supervises other individuals who perform counseling activities, or employs individuals through a corporation, their employees must present to their clients, prior to any counseling which necessitates a fee, two separate sheets of information. One sheet shall contain the information required in Section 2 concerning the employee, and one shall contain the information required in Section 2 for their employer and/or their supervisor. Any individual or corporation which employs counselors shall be directly responsible for their employees' compliance with the provisions of this Article.

Section 6

Any person who believes a violation of this Article has occurred may file a written or oral complaint with the Director of the Department of Registration and Education. The complaint shall state the name of the individual against whom the complaint is directed. The complaint shall state the date, place, and nature of the alleged offence.

The Director, upon receipt of a complaint, shall notify the Department's Investigative Unit which shall conduct a thorough investigation into the circumstances surrounding the complaint. If the Director determines that the complaint has not been filed on justifiable grounds, he shall dismiss the complaint without further hearing.

Section 7

Whenever, in the judgment of the Director, information supporting the complaint warrants a public hearing, such a hearing shall be conducted as soon as practicable after affording reasonable notice, a copy of the complaint, and an opportunity to testify at such hearing to both the person making the complaint and the person against whom the complaint is directed.

Section 8

At no time during any investigation, hearing or appeal related to a complaint against an individual pursuant to this Article may there be a release of personally identifiable records or files, or personal information contained therein, of a client, without the informed written consent of the client.

Section 9

Any party to a public hearing conducted by the Department, any person who files a complaint on which a hearing was denied, and any party adversely affected by a judgment of the Director may obtain judicial review, which shall be governed by the provisions of the Administrative Review Act, approved May 8, 1945, as amended and all amendments and modifications thereof and the rules adopted pursuant thereto.

Section 10

Whenever in the judgment of the Director after affording due notice and an opportunity for a hearing, any persons has engaged in an act or practice which constitutes a violation of any provision of this Article or any regulation or order issued thereunder, the Director shall report such violation to the Attorney General and the appropriate State's attorney.

Section 11

For the purposes of this Article, each violation of the provisions of this Article shall constitute a separate offense.

- Willful failure to file or willful filing of false or incomplete information required by this Article shall constitute a petty offence for the first offense, a Class C misdemeanor for the second offense, and a Class B misdemeanor for the third and each subsequent offense.

- Willful filing of a false complaint under this Article shall constitute a Class B misdemeanor.

- Subsequent to the third offense by an individual, the Director of the Department may deem it in the public interest to petition the Circuit Court to issue an order of the Court compelling compliance with an order issued by the Director, to restrain or prohibit a person from engaging in the business of marriage counselor, family counselor, child counselor, or counselor for a period of 6 months. If the Court finds that it has jurisdiction over the person of the alleged violator and that three separate violations have occurred by reason of the acts or practices of such person, the Court shall issue the appropriate order.

  Any individual that continues to conduct a business or counseling enterprise in violation of the Circuit Court's order shall be held in contempt of court and shall be subject to a Class A misdemeanor.

  A prosecution for any offense designated by this Article shall commence no later than 18 months after the commission of the offense.

Section 12

The appropriate State's attorney or the Attorney General shall bring such actions in the name of the people of the State of Illinois.

Section 13

As to any civil or criminal proceedings instituted under this Article venue shall lie in the county where the defendent resides.

APPENDIX C

Standards for the Preparation of Counselors

and Other Personnel Services Specialist

Appendices C-D-E-G-H deleted

APPENDIX F

Survey Letter and Questionnaire

Mailed to HDC Students

Box 804, George Peabody College
Nashville, TN 37203
April 24, 1978

Dear Human Development Counseling Student:

Enclosed is a survey I am conducting on the subject of credentialing and licensure for counselors. I hope to use the survey data as a part of my Ed.S. project.

As you may know the issue of credentialing and licensure for counselors is presently being examined by the American Personnel and Guidance Association. The APGA Special Committee for Credentialing recently completed its Final Report. In that report the Committee acknowledge that what was of "prime concern was the advancement of counselors as professionals, and that now is the time to get on with the task of credentialing for counselors."

I am interested in your opinions, as Human Development Counseling students, on the issue of credentialing. Because students in the Human Development Counseling Program have diverse backgrounds and career goals, some questions may not seem applicable. Your responses on those questions which you do have an opinion will be appreciated.

Enclosed is an addressed stamped envelope for your convenience. Since I'd like to get this (Ed.S.) project completed, the sooner you can get the survey back to me the better.

Your help is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Sparacio

Richard T. Sparacio

Enclosure

Counselor Questionnaire

Name _____ Age ___ Sex ___ Marital Status _____

1. Are you presently employed? Yes ___ No ___

2. A. If yes, what is your official title? _____
   B. If yes, what is your supervisor's title? _____

3. What is your desired area of specialization? _____
   (e.g. child care, secondary schools, corrections)

4. In which degree program are you presently enrolled? Please check.

   M.A. ___ Ed.D. ___
   Ed.S. ___ Other (please name) _____

5. A. Are you presently a member of any of the twelve national divisions of A.P.G.A.? Yes ___ No ___

   B. If yes, how long have you been a member? _____

   C. If yes, please check appropriate box.

   ___ ACPA -- American College Personnel Association
   ___ ACES -- Association for Education and Supervision
   ___ NVGA -- National Vocational Guidance Association
   ___ AHEAD -- Association for Humanistic Education and Development
   ___ ASCA -- American School Counselor Association
   ___ ARCA -- American Rehabilitation Counseling Association
   ___ AMEG -- Association for Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance
   ___ NECA -- National Employment Counselors Association
   ___ ANWC -- Association for Non-White Concerns
   ___ NCGC -- National Catholic Guidance Conference
   ___ ASGW -- Association for Specialists in Group Work
   ___ POCA -- Public Offenders Counselors Association
   ___ Other (please name) _____

6. Are you presently a member of any professional organizations at the state or local level? (please specify) T.P.G.A., etc.

   _____ _____
   _____

7. I am aware of the licensing issue for counselors as a form of credentialing presently being studied within A.P.G.A..

   Yes ___ No ___

8. I would support a licensing law for counselors in the state of Tennessee. Agree Disagree Undecided

9. If a licensing law were passed for counselors, and I qualified, I would apply for a license. Agree Disagree Undecided

10. I believe all counselors not certified should be credentialed by (a) licensure, or (b) program accreditation. (Please see definitions on page 3, if necessary). Agree Disagree Undecided

11. I prefer the following method or methods as the best form/s of credentialing. (Please rank (1-2-3-4) your preferred response or responses. Please see definitions on page 3, if necessary).
    1. licensure ____
    2. program accreditation ___
    3. certification ___
    4. none of the above ___
    5. all of the above ___

12. I believe that once a counselor graduates from an accredited university program no other credentialing procedure should be required. Agree Disagree Undecided

13. I believe all counselors work from some kind of basic theory or philosophy. Agree Disagree Undecided

14. I believe a counselor can be effective without a philosophical base. Agree Disagree Undecided

15. I believe most counselors have absolutely no philosophy upon which they base their activities. Agree Disagree Undecided

16. My supervisor understands my role as a counselor. Agree Disagree Undecided

17. I believe that there is a real need to clearly define the specific functions of counselors; to reduce confusion over the counselor's role. Agree Disagree Undecided

18. I believe the activities of most counselors are not clearly understood by non-counselors in my work setting. Agree Disagree Undecided

19. Comments welcomed. (Use additional paper if need be).

20. If you would like to have a breakdown of the results of this survey, please mark yes. Yes ___ No ___

APPENDIX G

Survey Results for

Track I and Track II Students

Track I

1 No response
7 single
8 married

Counselor Questionnaire

Name _____ Age Avg. 32.0 M 33.6F Sex 8 M 8 F Marital Status _____

1. Are you presently employed? Yes 5 No 11

2. A. If yes, what is your official title? _____
   B. If yes, what is your supervisor's title? _____

3. What is your desired area of specialization? Please see section titled desired (e.g. child care, secondary schools, corrections) area of students

4. In which degree program are you presently enrolled? Please check.

   M.A. 3 Ed.D. 7
   Ed.S. 6 Other (please name) _____

5. A. Are you presently a member of any of the twelve national divisions of A.P.G.A.? Yes 3 No 13

   B. If yes, how long have you been a member? _____

   C. If yes, please check appropriate box.

   ___ ACPA -- American College Personnel Association
   ___ ACES -- Association for Education and Supervision
   ___ NVGA -- National Vocational Guidance Association
   ___ AHEAD -- Association for Humanistic Education and Development
   ___ ASCA -- American School Counselor Association
   ___ ARCA -- American Rehabilitation Counseling Association
   ___ AMEG -- Association for Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance
   ___ NECA -- National Employment Counselors Association
   ___ ANWC -- Association for Non-White Concerns
   ___ NCGC -- National Catholic Guidance Conference
   ___ ASGW -- Association for Specialists in Group Work
   ___ POCA -- Public Offenders Counselors Association
   ___ Other (please name) _____

6. Are you presently a member of any professional organizations at the state or local level? (please specify) T.P.G.A., etc.

   4 yes
   12 no

7. I am aware of the licensing issue for counselors as a form of credentialing presently being studied within A.P.G.A..

   Yes 11 No 5

8. I would support a licensing law for counselors in the state of Tennessee.	Agree	Disagree	Undecided
	13	0	3

		Agree	Disagree	Undecided	N.A.
9.	If a licensing law were passed for counselors, and I qualified, I would apply for a license.	13	1	1	1
10.	I believe all counselors not certified should be credentialed by (a) licensure, or (b) program accreditation. (Please see definitions on page 3, if necessary).	Agree 12	Disagree 1	Undecided 3	
11.	I prefer the following method or methods as the best form/s of credentialing. (Please rank (1-2-3-4) your preferred response or responses. Please see definitions on page 3, if necessary).	1. licensure ___ 2. program accreditation ___ 3. certification ___ 4. none of the above ___ 5. all of the above ___			
12.	I believe that once a counselor graduates from an accredited university program no other credentialing procedure should be required.	Agree 4	Disagree 10	Undecided 2	
13.	I believe all counselors work from some kind of basic theory or philosophy.	Agree 9	Disagree 5	Undecided 2	
14.	I believe a counselor can be effective without a philosophical base.	Agree 1	Disagree 12	Undecided 3	
15.	I believe most counselors have absolutely no philosophy upon which they base their activities.	Agree 1	Disagree 12	Undecided 3	N.A. 2
16.	My supervisor understands my role as a counselor.	Agree 11	Disagree 1	Undecided 1	
17.	I believe that there is a real need to clearly define the specific functions of counselors; to reduce confusion over the counselor's role.	Agree 11	Disagree 3	Undecided 2	
18.	I believe the activities of most counselors are not clearly understood by non-counselors in my work setting.	Agree 7	Disagree 3	Undecided 3	N.A. 3

19. Comments welcomed. (Use additional paper if need be).
    Three students offered comments

20. If you would like to have a breakdown of the results of this survey, please mark yes. Yes ___ No ___

Track II

Counselor Questionnaire

Name _____ Avg. M 33.7 / Age F 39.8 Sex 3 M / 4 F Marital Status 1 single / 6 married

1. Are you presently employed? Yes 7 No 0

2. A. If yes, what is your official title? _____
   B. If yes, what is your supervisor's title? _____

3. What is your desired area of specialization? _____
   (e.g. child care, secondary schools, corrections)

4. In which degree program are you presently enrolled? Please check.

   M.A. 2 Ed.D. ___
   Ed.S. 4 Other (please name) 1 M.S.

5. A. Are you presently a member of any of the twelve national divisions of A.P.G.A.? Yes 1 No 6

   B. If yes, how long have you been a member? _____

   C. If yes, please check appropriate box.

   ___ ACPA -- American College Personnel Association
   ___ ACES -- Association for Education and Supervision
   ___ NVGA -- National Vocational Guidance Association
   ___ AHEAD -- Association for Humanistic Education and Development
   ___ ASCA -- American School Counselor Association
   ___ ARCA -- American Rehabilitation Counseling Association
   ___ AMEG -- Association for Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance
   ___ NECA -- National Employment Counselors Association
   ___ ANWC -- Association for Non-White Concerns
   ___ NCGC -- National Catholic Guidance Conference
   ___ ASGW -- Association for Specialists in Group Work
   ___ POCA -- Public Offenders Counselors Association
   ___ Other (please name) _____

6. Are you presently a member of any professional organizations at the state or local level? (please specify) T.P.G.A., etc.

   4 yes
   3 no

7. I am aware of the licensing issue for counselors as a form of credentialing presently being studied within A.P.G.A..

   Yes 5 No 2

8. I would support a licensing law for counselors in the state of Tennessee.

Agree	Disagree	Undecided	N.A.
2	1	3	1

9. If a licensing law were passed for counselors, and I qualified, I would apply for a license.

Agree	Disagree	Undecided
6	0	1

10. I believe all counselors not certified should be credentialed by (a) licensure, or (b) program accreditation. (Please see definitions on page 3, if necessary).

Agree	Disagree	Undecided	N.A.
4	0	2	1

11. I prefer the following method or methods as the best form/s of credentialing. (Please rank (1-2-3-4) your preferred response or responses. Please see definitions on page 3, if necessary).

1. licensure ____
2. program accreditation ___
3. certification ___
4. none of the above ___
5. all of the above ___

12. I believe that once a counselor graduates from an accredited university program no other credentialing procedure should be required.

Agree	Disagree	Undecided	N.A.
2	2	2	1

13. I believe all counselors work from some kind of basic theory or philosophy.

Agree	Disagree	Undecided
5	2	0

14. I believe a counselor can be effective without a philosophical base.

Agree	Disagree	Undecided
1	2	4

15. I believe most counselors have absolutely no philosophy upon which they base their activities.

Agree	Disagree	Undecided
0	7	0

16. My supervisor understands my role as a counselor.

Agree	Disagree	Undecided	N/A	No Res.
4	1	0	1	1

17. I believe that there is a real need to clearly define the specific functions of counselors; to reduce confusion over the counselor's role.

Agree	Disagree	Undecided
6	0	1

18. I believe the activities of most counselors are not clearly understood by non-counselors in my work setting.

Agree	Disagree	Undecided	No Res.
5	1	0	1

19. Comments welcomed. (Use additional paper if need be).

No comments

20. If you would like to have a breakdown of the results of this survey, please mark yes. Yes 5 No 2